

ORIGINAL

005097

BEFORE THE
POSTAL RATE COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, DC 20268-0001

RECEIVED
SEP 4 8 36 AM '96
POSTAL RATE COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

SPECIAL SERVICES REFORM, 1996

Docket No. MC96-3

DOUGLAS F. CARLSON
MOTION TO COMPEL UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE
WITNESS JOHN F. LANDWEHR
TO ANSWER INTERROGATORY DFC/USPS-T3-1(c)

August 31, 1996

Pursuant to section 25(d) of the Rules of Practice, I, Douglas F. Carlson, hereby request that the commission order United States Postal Service witness John F. Landwehr to answer interrogatory DFC/USPS-T3-1(c).

BACKGROUND

Referring to witness Landwehr's testimony concerning the post offices in Middleburg, VA, San Luis, AZ, and Blaine, WA, interrogatory DFC/USPS-T3-1 reads as follows:

On page 10, lines 14-16, you stated, "My experience leads me to conclude that while these offices are atypical in the pool of all post offices, there are also many similar offices nationwide."

(a) * * *

(b) * * *

(c) Please confirm that these "similar" post offices are, nevertheless, atypical in the pool of all post offices. If you do not confirm, please explain how post offices that are similar to "atypical" post offices are not also, themselves, "atypical."

Witness Landwehr responded to subsection (c) as follows:

Please see USPS-T-3, page ten, lines 14-16.



DISCUSSION

By merely referring me back to the original testimony on which my question was based, the Postal Service has failed to answer the question. Witness Landwehr's sentence strongly suggests that these "many similar post offices nationwide" are, themselves, atypical in the pool of all post offices. However, perhaps so "many" similar post offices exist that they are commonplace and no longer can be considered atypical. Or perhaps, for some reason, witness Landwehr does not consider these "similar" post offices to be atypical. A straightforward answer to this question would clarify whether the "many similar offices nationwide" are, nonetheless, atypical.

In the spirit of reducing motion practice (see Presiding Officer's Ruling No. MC96-3/3, Attachment B, p. 2), I contacted counsel for the Postal Service on August 28, 1996, to request a revised answer. Counsel refused to provide a revised answer to my question. The Postal Service's attempt to evade my question contradicts the commission's desire to expedite discovery through written interrogatories. See Rules of Practice § 25 and Ruling No. MC96-3/3, Attachment B, p. 6.

CONCLUSION

Interrogatory DFC/USPS-T3-1(c) is a simple, straightforward question designed to clarify witness Landwehr's testimony. The question is highly relevant to


this proceeding because it will explain whether part of the justification for the Postal Service's proposed nonresident fee, which would affect box customers at post offices nationwide, is based primarily on testimony about the experiences of atypical post offices. Therefore, I respectfully request that the commission order the Postal Service to provide a simple, straightforward answer.

Dated: August 31, 1996


DOUGLAS F. CARLSON

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have this day served the foregoing document upon the required participants of record in accordance with section 12 of the Rules of Practice and sections 3(B)(3) and 3(C) of the Special Rules of Practice.


DOUGLAS F. CARLSON

August 31, 1996
Emeryville, California